

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration of the above-identified application is requested in view of the remarks that follow.

Since this response has been filed within two months after the January 9, 2006, mailing date of the Final Rejection in this application, the timely issuance of an Advisory Action is requested.

In the January 9, 2006, Office Action in this application, the Examiner objected to the drawings. Specifically, the Examiner stated that the arrow of the body of transistor 104 should point in instead of out. The examiner also cited several labeling issues with respect to Figs. 1C, 1D, 2A, 2B and 4.

Replacement drawings to meet the objections stated by the Examiner are enclosed herewith.

The Examiner also objected to the disclosure at page 2, line 22.

As indicated above, Applicant's disclosure has been amended to meet the Examiner's objection.

The examiner objected to informalities in claims 3 and 4. Claim 3 has been amended as suggested. Claim 4 has been cancelled.

The Examiner indicated that claims 1 and 3 were allowable if the informalities in claim 3 were corrected. These corrections to claim 3 having been made, it is believed that claims 1 and 3 are now in condition for allowance.

Claim 2 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by the Thomson et al. '502 patent.

Claim 2 has been cancelled.

For the reasons set forth above, Applicant submits that all claims now present in this application are in compliance with all requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112 and patentably distinguish over the prior art. Therefore, it is requested that this application be passed to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

STALLMAN & POLLOCK LLP

Dated: March 9, 2006

By: 

Michael J. Pollock  
Reg. No. 29,098

Attorneys for Applicant(s)